



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,529	02/12/2004	Mark Charles Davis	IBMS.075PA(0527)	5127

62627 7590 06/28/2007  
DAVID W. LYNCH  
CHAMBLISS, BAHNER & STOPHEL  
1000 TALLAN SQUARE-S  
TWO UNION SQUARE  
CHATTANOOGA, TN 37402

EXAMINER
----------

SCHLIE, PAUL W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2186

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/28/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/777,529	DAVIS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Paul W. Schlie	2186	

**All Participants:**

(1) Paul W. Schlie (USPTO).

(2) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Status of Application: pending**

(3) David W. Lynch (Applicant's Attorney).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview: 5 June 2007**

**Time: ~ 1:00pm**

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*U.S.C. 103 & ODP over 10/777,531*

Claims discussed:

39-53

Prior art documents discussed:

*Krum et al.*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**PIERRE BATAILLE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

6/14/07

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed that Krum et al, nor other prior art of record clearly taught a multi-level hierarchically configured mass storage system being further limited by a specific linear configuration of sub storage elements proposed to be presented in a forth coming amendment, and was further agreed that such a set of claims would be reasonably considered obvious in view of similarly amended claims presented for co-pending application 10/777,531; thereby the examiner will delay response to the pending application until after timely receipt of the proposed further amended claims and corresponding anticipated TD..